

## **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action of September 5, 2008 and further in response to the Advisory Action of January 12, 2009 in which the Examiner asserted that the claims do not distinguish over Verwohit ; and that claims 2-5 are rejected as unpatentable over Verwohit in view of Helger in view of Stanchfield.

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below; and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner says that the formation is not exactly at the end of the tube. This characterization is not understood. The claims says "a formation providing a connector portion at the second end of the tube". It is submitted that the formation is at the end of the tube, not just near it or around it. To say it is "exactly" at the end of the tube is somewhat meaningless because it is hard to say where exactly the end of the tube is. If the formation is a separate part mounted at the flat end of the tube, then does the formation extend the tube and change where the end is? Applicant has attempted to say that the formation is at the end of the tube, not somewhere between the center of the tube and the end; not even adjacent the end of the tube (which is what the reference shows) but at the end.

The claim has been clarified to recite first and second ends so it is easy to understand. The claim has also been clarified to say that the formation fits through the through hole and engages the bottom surface of the plate. The reference does not do this because the detents that engage the tube near the lower end are above the bottom surface of the tube. The tube in the reference does not engage either side of the bottom of the plate. It engages the detents which are at the top of the plate. So, the claim specifies which surface is involved, namely the bottom surface; and the claim recites that the formation is at the bottom of the tube and fits through

the through hole to snap fit into engagement with the bottom surface of the plate.

It is believed that the claims fully distinguish over the references. The combination suggested by the Examiner does not follow because even if the combination were appropriate, the claimed structure would not follow. The reference does not engage the bottom surface by extending through the through holes.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider his rejection of the claims, the allowance of which is earnestly solicited.

If additional fees are required, the Director is authorized to charge Deposit Account 504147 or credit any overpayment thereto.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. De Luca  
/John P. De Luca/  
Registration No. 25,505  
Attorney for Applicant

John P. De Luca  
17420 Ryefield Ct.  
Dickerson, MD 20842  
301 349 2899  
[jpd@jpdip.net](mailto:jpd@jpdip.net)